

**SPECIAL MEETING
BOARD OF MAYOR AND ALDERMEN**

June 11, 2001

5:30 PM

Mayor Baines called the meeting to order.

Mayor Baines called for the Pledge of Allegiance, this function being led by Alderman Shea.

Mayor Baines stated would everyone please remain standing and pause for a moment of silent prayer and I'd ask you to keep in your thoughts and prayers Mary Sysyn's brother John Bolos who passed away and would observe a moment of silent in his name this evening.

The Clerk called the roll. There were twelve Aldermen present.

Present: Aldermen Wihby, Gatsas, Levasseur, Pinard, O'Neil, Lopez, Shea, Vaillancourt, Pariseau, Cashin, Thibault Hirschmann

Absent: Aldermen Sysyn and Clancy

4. Ratify and confirm poll conducted June 7, 2001 directing the Chief of Police or his designee to issue civil forfeitures for each unlicensed dog to the persons named in the warrant available for viewing at the City Clerk's Office (Aldermen Wihby, Levasseur, Sysyn, Clancy, Pinard, Shea, Vaillancourt, Pariseau, Cashin, Thibault, Hirschmann, Lopez and O'Neil voted in favor of and Aldermen Gatsas was unavailable.)

Alderman Thibault moved to ratify and confirm the poll conducted. Alderman Pariseau duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

5. Ratify and confirm poll conducted June 7, 2001 approving contract between the City and Riverfront Foundation for the use of the Rubenstein Parking Lot by the Foundation for concerts on June 9th and 19th. The Foundation shall:
 - indemnify and hold the City harmless;
 - provide insurance approved by the Risk Manager and name the City as an additional insured;
 - provide all security personnel; and
 - be responsible for clean-up the day after the concerts.

The City and the Riverfront Foundation agree to negotiate a long-term agreement for the use of the Rubenstein Lot and the So. Commercial Street Lot presently under lease to the Foundation. Agreement to be under the supervision of the Traffic Department, and prepared by the City Solicitor.

(Aldermen Wihby, Levasseur, Sysyn, Clancy, Pinard, Shea, Cashin, Thibault, Hirschmann, Lopez and O'Neil voted in favor of; Aldermen Vaillancourt and Pariseau voted in opposition to; and Aldermen Gatsas was unavailable.)

Alderman Hirschmann moved to ratify and confirm the poll conducted. Alderman Lopez duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Vaillancourt stated I did vote against this notwithstanding my inclination to vote against telephone polls, I would have voted against this even if it were not for that. We were under the impression that this was going to come back to the Traffic Committee last week and it never did. We also were under the impression that there was going to be some negotiation in progress for a percentage for the City to get. The City paid for this parking lot, a consider amount of money, and now we're simply going to give it to some promoter to use and have him reap the benefits. I don't think that's very good business. The number that we were given as a percentage that the City might get was 25%. In other words, the developer or the promoter is going to keep 75% and the City which took the expense of building a lot only 25%. I just don't think that makes any sense at all. I hope we can sharpen our pencil and certainly...it should be 75-25 the other way, if anything.

Alderman Hirschmann stated, Alderman Vaillancourt, what we did is we did have a negotiation with the Riverfront Park Foundation and the promoter and the City and all parties concerned and the first event was deemed that it was too late and they agreed to not charge the promoter a fee and we discussing a future agreement which will include the items stated...indemnify hold the City harmless and come to an agreement that is fair to both parties. If we took money out of the Charlie Daniels Concert it would have come out of the Foundation and they have bonds to pay in July and we'd like them to be able to pay their bonds, so the first one was a freebee and I hope they do well that is our intention.

Alderman Pariseau stated I would like to go back to what Alderman Hirschmann said relative to the bond that the Riverfront Foundation and they owed the City that much money anyway. So, why I voted against this was number one, it didn't come back to the Traffic Committee like it should have and number two, at the Traffic Committee it was discussed that the City was going to get some revenue and then when I was asked to vote and spoke to the Finance Officer, he told me that rather than they being charged that we were going to let them pay towards their debt. Well, the City is still behind the 8-ball and in your Accounts Committee there's a thing there that is past due in the amount of what (\$74,000) and the City is giving stuff away at the expense of the taxpayers.

Alderman Hirschmann stated the Foundation, I believe, is not past due. I believe that is a July payment, is that true, Kevin.

Mr. Clougherty replied they usually make their payments the end of this month.

Alderman Hirschmann stated a little inaccuracy, we are trying to help the Foundation.

Alderman Pariseau interjected no, it's not an inaccuracy...that is the way I got it and I'll show it to you.

Alderman Lopez stated I agree with what Alderman Pariseau said and what Alderman Hirschmann and also with what Alderman Vaillancourt said. The most important thing was to solve the problem at-hand last weekend and it was agreed by all parties to let them use it and the Foundation and a committee was set up (Tom Clark, Kevin, and others) to be on that committee to make a long-term agreement and I'm sure that long-term agreement will come back to the Traffic Committee and if it needs a formal motion, I'll put that in a formal motion.

Alderman Vaillancourt stated after what I've heard now, I would be even more opposed to this. I was hoping, at least, that when that negotiation is completed it would be retroactive to the concert that was held this past weekend, so if we were getting 25 or 50 percent we could at least make it retroactive to pick those up. This would be like saying well, we haven't negotiated in a timely manner, so we're just going to give you something. It should certainly be retroactive...what were they charging \$8.00 a parking spot there...\$9.00!!!...I assume they made a lot of money and I would hope that in that negotiation process, at least push for retroactivity.

Mayor Baines stated that would come back to the Board and it would be up to the Board to decide on that.

Alderman Pariseau stated for Alderman Hirschmann's edification, is Item 6 on your committee agenda which lists 90 days past due the Riverfront Park Foundation, Inc. is listed in the amount of \$74,980.

Alderman Hirschmann stated it may be an early billing, Alderman. Traditionally, they pay that in the summer that is when they have their events. So, the City does not see that as past due. The Finance Director expects that money in July, so that's the end of that.

Mayor Baines called for a vote on the motion. The motion carried with Aldermen Gatsas, Vaillancourt and Pariseau duly recorded in opposition.

- 16.** Communication from Human Resources requesting authorization to hire four security officers (utilizing enclosed class spec) for a 90-day period to meet security needs; such action to allow meeting security needs while following normal procedures (HR Committee review and Ordinance process) for permanent action by the fall.

Mayor Baines stated with the consent of the Board, I would like to move to Item 16 as people have asked we address this early before we get into the budget. The proposal

that's on the floor right now that's in the budget is the less costly of the alternatives to that correct, Alderman Wihby.

Alderman Lopez moved to accept the recommendation of the Human Resources Committee in hiring four part-timers for security. Alderman Thibault duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Vaillancourt asked why are we doing this out-of-order.

Mayor Baines replied because of the budget.

Alderman Lopez stated there has been some discussion as to whether this item was going to be approved to hire four part-time security people versus what we have now and if we continue the contract as we have now, naturally, the budget is going to increase. So, in previous discussion by this Board during the budget process we came up with the total figures as indicated in your packet to hire four part-time security officers for City Hall and the Library. So, this has to be approved and if it's not approved then we have to go back and add some more money to continue the security.

Alderman Levasseur asked who are these security officers going to report to, is it the City Clerk's Office.

Alderman Lopez replied they will be reporting to Red Robidas and in turn the security person that works for City Hall will report to the City Clerk for instructions.

Alderman Levasseur stated I thought we only had one security officer at this time or do we have four, I thought we had one.

Alderman Lopez replied we have Library...

Alderman Levasseur stated this isn't just for City Hall it's for all over the City.

Alderman Lopez stated remember we transferred the money from the Library to security with Red Robidas.

Alderman Wihby stated we all had that memo on June 1st and in the budget that is sitting on the table there's \$75,000 allocated for security. We were told that if we did it a different way it was going to run between \$92,000 and \$100,000. So, we took this item first because if we're not going to go along with the recommendation of doing the \$75,000 we're going to have to add money into the budget or another \$25,000 to probably do it another way.

Mayor Baines called for a vote on the motion. The motion carried with Aldermen Levasseur and Pariseau duly recorded in opposition.

6. Appropriating Resolution

“Amending a Resolution ‘A Resolution Appropriating to the Manchester Aggregation Program the sum of \$758,516 from Aggregation Fees for the Fiscal Year 2002.’”

On motion of Alderman Pariseau, duly seconded by Alderman Wihby, it was voted that the Resolution be read by title only, and it was so done.

Alderman Thibault moved that the Resolution pass and be enrolled. Alderman Pariseau duly seconded the motion.

Alderman O'Neil stated that has the condition of not spending more than (I think) \$100,000, thank you.

Mayor Baines called for a vote on the motion. The motion carried with Aldermen Shea, Vaillancourt and Hirschmann duly recorded in opposition.

7. Appropriating Resolution

“A Resolution appropriating to the Manchester Airport Authority the sum of \$34,951,867 from Special Airport Revenue Funds for Fiscal Year 2002.”

On motion of Alderman Cashin, duly seconded by Alderman Pinard, it was voted that the Resolution be read by title only, and it was so done.

Alderman Cashin moved that the Resolution pass and be enrolled. Alderman Shea duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

8. Appropriating Resolution:

“Continuation of the Central Business Service District.”

On motion of Alderman Thibault, duly seconded by Alderman Pariseau, it was voted that the Resolution be read by title only, and it was so done.

Alderman Pariseau moved that the Resolution pass and be enrolled. Alderman O'Neil duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

9. Appropriating Resolution:

“Appropriating to the Central Business Service District the sum of Two Hundred and Five Thousand Eight Hundred Thirty Two Dollars and Ninety Nine Cents (\$205,832.99) from Central Business Service District Funds for Fiscal Year 2002.”

On motion of Alderman Lopez, duly seconded by Alderman Pariseau, it was voted that the Resolution be read by title only, and it was so done.

Alderman Levasseur moved that the Resolution pass and be enrolled. Alderman Shea duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

10. Appropriating Resolution:

“Amending a Resolution ‘A Resolution appropriating the sum of \$12,791,347 from Sewer User Rental Charges to the Environmental Protection Division for Fiscal Year 2002’ to \$13,126,513.”

On motion of Alderman Shea, duly seconded by Alderman Pariseau, it was voted that the Resolution be read by title only, and it was so done.

Alderman Pinard moved that the Resolution pass and be enrolled. Alderman Shea duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

11. Appropriating Resolution:

“Amending a Resolution ‘A Resolution appropriating the sum of \$3,751,196 from Recreation User Charges to the Recreation Division for Fiscal Year 2002’ to \$3,761,196.”

On motion of Alderman Lopez, duly seconded by Alderman Shea, it was voted that the Resolution be read by title only, and it was so done.

Alderman O'Neil moved that the Resolution pass and be enrolled. Alderman Wihby duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

12. Appropriating Resolution:

“Amending a Resolution ‘A Resolution appropriating to the Manchester School District the sum of \$114,844,857 for the Fiscal Year 2002’ to \$115,844,857.”

On motion of Alderman Wihby, duly seconded by Alderman Pariseau, it was voted that the Resolution be read by title only, and it was so done.

Alderman Wihby moved that the Resolution be read by title only. Alderman Pariseau duly seconded the motion. The motion carried with Alderman Hirschmann duly recorded in opposition.

Alderman Wihby stated at this time, if you remember, we talked about the million dollars in there and it should be \$964,000 because we were going to leave the \$36,000 in CIP budget for Frank's cash so he could go ahead with Gill Stadium and moved that the number should be amended to \$115,808,857 which is taking out \$36,000 and leaving it in the CIP number, so we could have it for cash. Alderman Pinard duly seconded the motion. The motion to amend carried with Alderman Levasseur and Hirschmann duly recorded in opposition.

Alderman Wihby moved that the Resolution as amended pass and be enrolled. Alderman Lopez duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Wihby stated to set the stage in front of us we have a list...I know that Frank had given us a list, but there's a new list in front of us that just came to us adding up to that \$964,000 total. I know Brad's here to speak on it and the concern is...that is why the School Finance Chairman is here is to make sure we feel comfortable that this money would be used for the purposes intended, so they sat down with Frank and came up with this new sheet and if you want to talk to Brad, I guess now is the time to get Brad up here.

Alderman Levasseur stated I wouldn't have a problem speaking with Brad, but Brad's not running for at-large anymore so we're not going to have him next year...who is going to sign the contract saying that these things are going to be done specifically.

Mayor Baines asked, Frank, would you please come forward and talk about your discussions about this project.

Mr. Thomas stated we met with Ron Chapman from the School District today and we went over this revised SCIP list of projects. This SCIP list has been reduced, as Alderman Wihby said to that \$964,000 figure to cover work that we want to do at Gill Stadium without any delay. This list is going tomorrow night to the School Building and Sites Committee for their review and the Buildings and Sites Committee will then give authorization to our department to proceed with these projects.

Alderman Hirschmann stated I understand why Alderman Wihby wants to do this. The only problem is for each one of these projects, Frank, I don't know how many there are there are five pages of them...probably a hundred different projects...you have to send a

bill to them for every project now rather than having your own sum of money that you draw down from.

Mr. Thomas stated that is correct, we're hoping tomorrow to convince the School District to give us authorization to proceed on projects that we feel need early authorization to move on so that we can guarantee that the work will get done over the summer. They can issue us work orders or we can bill them directly somehow for the work.

Alderman Hirschmann stated I appreciate that. Your Honor, if this money was left with Public Building Services of which Mr. Thomas is the Director, I think that the work would get done and paid quicker and I would be the first guy on the phone when all of these bills start ending up on my agendas saying that they're not paid. I'm going to be the first guy in these Chambers saying "I told you so", so I hope Mr. Chapman whenever you see a bill to repair a school that you pay it because I'm in support of the schools and I want to see this stuff paid.

Alderman Levasseur stated the great thing right now is that the money is here, it's the same amount of money whether we put it with the schools or whether we keep it right here on our side and let Frank...who's done a good job doing it over the last year...we gave him a million dollars, the money was spent for projects. There is absolutely no reason to take the chance of putting it in their budget, I don't understand why it has to be put in their budget to make it look like we're giving them \$116. We're not taking away a million dollars from the schools, we're just putting it into where the money is to be managed, where the money is to be billed, and we don't have to do these things with all these chargebacks...I would like to say that...

Mayor Baines stated let me just say something first. It has to be included as part of their overall appropriation or else they don't have the appropriation. What happened in the past was that the million dollars was in CIP and it was a chargeback, so it was part of their overall appropriation. So, you need to have it as part of the overall appropriation. Also, Mr. Clougherty talked to the Department of Revenue Administration and I'd ask him to explain what their response was about this issue as well.

Mr. Clougherty stated the Deputy Director of the Department of Revenue Administration said basically what you just said Mayor, it should be included in their appropriation if they want to avoid confusion in the future...if this is an area that's been contested the best way to do it is to put it in their budget.

Alderman Wibby stated when you start charging tuition that number could be counted.

Alderman Levasseur stated the tuition is not going up or down.

Alderman Wihby stated it does go up by a million dollars.

Alderman Shea stated, Frank, you've had dealing with Ron Chapman in the past have you found him to be an honorable fellow that you can rely on. When you get together with him and decide certain things, things usually work out when he does give his commitment.

Mr. Thomas replied yes.

Alderman Lopez stated I believe there is a plan here that has been put into place that has been worked on...it's for maintenance and I'm sure that the School Department will go along with the maintenance, I don't foresee any problems myself.

Mayor Baines interjected everybody wants to get the schools fixed.

Alderman Vaillancourt stated problems have developed in the past, so I'm not sure how we can be so confident they won't in the future and regarding the assertions of the honesty and integrity of Mr. Chapman he frankly is not the person running the School District, so I am not so sure that we can take him as the ultimate authority in this. So, I'm conflicted on how to vote on this particular part of it. I think as you've noted for the sake of building it into the tuition fund we probably should do it to capture that extra money from Bedford and all the other towns that are coming here. However, I just want to speak to the overall motion, I believe, we're on that portion now and I can't support the overall motion. Every other department or most departments in the City have taken a paltry one-half percent cut and when you're talking about small departments of a couple of million dollars it's more difficult to come up with the one-half percent cut than when you're talking over \$115 million. So, I think it would be only fair to ask the School Department to assume the same responsibility that the rest of the City departments or most of them have been asked to assume which would be to apply that one-half percent cut and it wouldn't amount to very much, about what \$550,000 or something therein. So, for the sake of equity in treating all departments the same, I feel it's necessary to ask for that one-half percent cut there and as I said I'm willing to be overly generous. I think this is an extraordinarily generous proposition and all of the people that call should realize that we are being generous to the schools, we are getting more money from Concord and we're applying it to that. We also have to realize that this money from Concord just doesn't fall from the sky like manna from heaven, you're being taxed some other way for the State to generate that. But, to say that it is just something that is a freebee is not accurate. So, I would support this if it had the half a percent cut, but until that time I can't do it.

Alderman Hirschmann stated the Alderman that proposed letting the schools hold this money, even though it is already spoken for, has also proposed a Charter amendment

because the schools have overspent in the past. So, I'm finding some conflicting history here to vote on. I'm suppose to vote on a Charter amendment in the fall, but I'm suppose to give them this money and trust them. I don't know where people are coming from anymore. So, I am going to vote no on this and let them do what they want to do.

Mayor Baines stated I will let Alderman Wihby respond to that.

Alderman Wihby stated hopefully the Charter will go through and it will be all one number and it won't matter.

Alderman Levasseur stated I also have a problem with that because I'm also support Alderman Wihby's Charter reform because I feel that the Mayor of the City of Manchester who was duly elected by the people for the mandate that he goes out to be elected for should have the bottom line control over these numbers and you do not have line item control over the School Board, so they can spend the money the way they want to spend the money without any direction from you except for your vote on the School Board and I believe that the Charter was meant to give more power to the Mayor, to allow that person to have a little bit more of a dictate of what that person in the Mayor's seat saw as his vision for the City and I also have a problem with the fact that we're going to appropriate close to a million dollars, yet the Building and Sites Committee is going to vote on this tomorrow whether to approve this. They haven't yet voted on this and now we're going to give them the money and then just hope that they do and this is not the way you should be doing things. If they had already voted on it to approve this then I probably could be a little bit more generous in a vote towards them, but yet they haven't voted on that and we don't know if they will vote to follow the plan that has already been put in effect by Mr. Thomas and I also believe, your Honor, that we should be rewarding department heads who do a good job. We shouldn't be throwing money at places where there is poor management and I don't think that there are too many people in this room that think that their management of the School Department has been very good, but we all probably here in this room could agree that Mr. Thomas has been very good at managing his department and I feel very confident that if we give him this money that this money will be properly managed and attended to. So, your Honor, I will vote against this.

Mayor Baines stated just a clarification... the Charter amendment will not give line item control to the Mayor or to the Aldermen. The State law is very clear that only give the School District or School Department a bottom line number, we cannot manage their accounts, as I understand it. Who knows how it will be interpreted.

Alderman Cashin stated I am going to ask this Board to fully fund this budget at \$115,844,857...I think it's required to do this, I think it gives us an opportunity to show that we do have faith in the School Board and we are trying to cooperate and I'd ask for the majority of this Board to fund this.

Alderman Wihby stated just a clarification from Frank. Frank, normally you put a list together and you spend the million dollars, do you make that list up.

Mr. Thomas replied we generate the list, the list is submitted to the School District both the Buildings and Sites Committee and the full Board.

Alderman Wihby stated so right now you make a list and you bring it to them. What happens to...say, we left it the old way, you had the million dollars and you made a list up and they decided to change something can they do it.

Mr. Thomas replied not really, theoretically; however, if they had a problem with a project that we would propose we would probably sit down and try to negotiate and resolve...in the last couple of years I'm not aware that we've had any disputes on what projects we were going to do out of that SCIP cash allocation.

Alderman Wihby stated so you went forward with their input and both of you together sat down with that million dollars in the past and worked on that. Do you see a problem with them, with changing this over and being able to get tuition money out of it and giving you the chance to sit down and vote on this. What was the attitude today at the table.

Mr. Thomas replied I think it was very good. I think it was a positive meeting, very positive. We got a good handle on what our overall chargebacks would be and what procedure we had to follow with the SCIP cash. Our point that we try to make to Mr. Chapman is that in order for us to somewhat guarantee that the projects are going to get done over the summer months, we have to have early authorization. Now, if we get authorization on these projects tomorrow I feel comfortable that we can work with the School District in some kind of billing fashion to make sure that the projects do get done and that's my interest to get the work done.

Alderman Wihby stated the plan that we had seen last week when you mailed it to us...when you sat down...the plan that is coming forward is from both of you isn't it.

Mr. Thomas replied yes. We modified in order to build in design monies for Central High School renovations and so that was the major change today. Basically, our discussion today was not so much on each particular project...the School District is still with this list depending on our input. We were more or less looking at how do we make it work.

Alderman Gatsas stated I don't think we should fool ourselves one bit that no where should this Board...if they're going to give the School Department \$115 million that is what we should be giving them and we should not, for one second, believe that we can

direct them on how to spend one penny because we don't have that ability. So, either we're going to give it to them with no strings because I believe that until we get the court resolution in place that says yes we, can or no, we can't then either we're giving them \$115 or we're giving them \$114. If we're sitting here saying that a million dollars should be spent on schools and we're concerned that it's not going to affect the tuition and it's not going to be on the MS forms, we should as a City say these are the things we are going to do and we're going to spend it from the City side and we will do the work and the million dollars will be spent from our end. If we're concerned that we are not going to be paid for it or the chargebacks aren't going to happen then we're starting off on the wrong foot. Then either do the work on the City and say this is the contribution we're doing to the schools is a million dollars for the SCIP account and Frank's going to do the work and get the work done because then we know it's done and we don't have to worry about the chargebacks or give them the \$115 and if they say that they want to change the plan they have in front of us we can't control that. So, nobody on this Board should be upset if they say "X" amount of dollars should be spent on Smyth Road and it doesn't get spent there and they spend it on Webster School then we shouldn't be upset by it. So, either we sit here and say we're going to do the work at the school level, spend the million dollars as the way we want to spend the money here or we give them the million dollars and tell them to spend it the best way you see, but make sure you pay us back. So, those are the two choices we have. I don't think there're too complicated.

Alderman Shea stated what we're leaving out is the fact that this list is generated from the school principals...they decide to an extent what's wrong with the school that they are administrating and then people from their department go and look it over and make a judgment. So, the input is not necessarily at a table that you sit down with Ron Chapman, it the administrators like Nancy Tessier and other people that are principals who know what's best for their school.

Mr. Thomas stated that is exactly correct. We get input from the schools during the course of the year and we try to address them through the SCIP process.

Alderman Shea stated they are going to be in the schools because they're working now more days, so they'll be around the schools and knowing what's going on, so I think it's a no brainer, we'll add it to the School budget that's what I think.

Mayor Baines stated Mrs. Tessier especially gives input too, I want to stress that.

Alderman Levasseur stated I like that because you just made a great point, Alderman Shea, you said that the principals are the ones that are interacting with what they want fixed at their schools and this is absolutely perfect because everything they've asked for has been put on a list and now that we have the money on this side and Frank has control of it the principal's will be getting what they asked for, they're the ones that know what

their schools need, they're the ones who work there day in and day out everyday. So, with this list generated their wishes are going to be fulfilled. If they give it to the School Board or to somebody else they're going to be well we got the hands in another fate...the Aldermen are here saying here we are, there's the million, here's your list...we approve and here it is. But, the question I have, your Honor, is when we do these expansions on buildings and we charge...we did McLaughlin for \$3 million...we didn't give the School Board \$3 million and then they went and did it. We approved it on our side...those chargebacks get put on that MS form...what's the difference between this one million dollars being not allowed to be put on that form and if it's not being put on that form that's kind of crazy because it's still a cost to the schools, it's just a matter of who's managing the money.

Mayor Baines stated that's bonding and Mr. Clougherty will explain that to people.

Mr. Clougherty stated the Board appropriates an amount for debt service and that's provided to the School Board and they understand that that's an obligation...but, it's a general obligation to the City and the City has to pay that even if the School doesn't, we have to pay that although there's an appropriate and we've never had a problem they've made some late payments, but they've always provided the dollars to do that. The difference here is we are talking about a cash appropriation as opposed to a debt appropriation.

Alderman Levasseur stated the difference with a cash appropriation is this...you give them a note for one million dollars and when they want the money they come to us and they'll write the check for them; that is all it is is a transaction. All we do is say here's the million, you've got it, you want you just send us a little piece of paper saying how much it costs and it's done. It's really that simple and your principals will be getting...Alderman Shea, in all due deference they'll be getting exactly what they do want because they put the list together and I feel safer with the principals getting what they want from here with this money and this list generated than I do by sending it back over to the schools with that money.

Alderman Hirschmann stated the appropriating resolution says \$115.844 million...that includes the million of maintenance we just talked about. Before the fast ball hits the mitt it also should be said that this includes \$850,000 of deficit reduction that you had included in your budget that Alderman Wihby has taken out so there is an \$850,000 that the School District does have to absorb, so I think I will vote for this number. I think it's starting to look a little better.

Mayor Baines recessed the regular meeting to consult with City officials.

Mayor Baines called the meeting back to order.

Mayor Baines stated after consultation with the City Solicitor and the Finance Officer it's my recommending that we leave it as is and ask the Board to vote the \$115,808,857...any further discussion.

Alderman Vaillancourt stated yes, your Honor, perhaps you could enlighten us as to what happened in this consultation that was not in public session.

Mayor Baines replied we were just asking if there was some way to deal with that...the situation with not being as a School part of the appropriation. It would come over to the City and then the City would absorb it as it's appropriation on the City side so, therefore, it's my feeling is it belongs where it is, it gets charged to the schools, it becomes the schools responsibility and we expect that work to be done. I don't think there's going to be any disagreement on doing that work, I really don't. People want the schools fixed and we have to encourage that to happen. Obviously, I'm only one vote on the school side, but I think there are at least two votes in this room to make sure that occurs.

Alderman Vaillancourt stated I just wanted to follow-up...does anybody have a calculation that could set in motion the process of determining what exactly this would mean on that tuition rate that we speak of, is it ten cents a student, \$10.00, a \$100.00...do you have any idea what this is. Any ballpark figure...not very much is it.

Mr. Clougherty replied I don't know. We haven't done that for the last few years, Mr. Chapman might be able to tell you.

Alderman Gatsas asked how many total students from outside the District, it's eleven hundred, I think.

Mayor Baines replied eleven to twelve hundred isn't it. I don't know if I have the School report in here, I have the School Board agenda in here tonight too.

Alderman Vaillancourt stated while you're looking that up I'd like to get some more clarification on this tuition money. As we spend more and more on schools and this is in fact a 7.5% increase; that in itself is going to drive up the tuition because it's based on what we spend. Now, in the projections that the School Board has built in about their incoming revenue have you built in the increase in the tuition, into the revenues you're projecting or are you going to find that you have a windfall with this incoming revenue that's actually going to be more than we would ordinarily give you.

Mayor Baines stated it has to be based upon the cost of educating a high school kid in Manchester.

Alderman Vaillancourt stated I understand that but the question is when they calculated their incoming revenues did they use the new tuition figure or did they use the old tuition figure. If they used the old tuition figure they're going to end up with a windfall that is going to give them more money than this Board originally intends and would they have to come back to us...

Mayor Baines interjected it has to be appropriated.

Alderman Vaillancourt stated they would have to come back.

Mayor Baines stated when there's additional monies that comes in it has to be appropriated by this Board.

Alderman Gatsas stated \$56.70 per student of the 17,000. So, on 1,600 students it's approximately \$90,000.

Alderman Lopez asked I wonder if the Chairman of the Finance Committee Brad Cook could address a question.

Mayor Baines asked, School Committee Member Cook, please come forward.

Alderman Lopez stated I plan on voting for \$115 million...you as the Chairman of the Finance Committee will you be recommending that the maintenance that has been presented to us be given to capital projects to Frank Thomas so he can complete this.

School Committee Member Cook replied yes, Sir, and to confirm what Mr. Thomas said...the process we've used for several years...all the years I've been on the Board, but especially since Mr. Thomas' department has been in charge of maintenance has been very collaborative. They have been included in our budget process, they've sent a representative to the Building and Sites Committee on which I do not sit. Regularly, we talk about projects, we agree upon projects, we reprioritize projects, we're on the same page on the projects and we haven't had a great deal, if any, controversy about it. They sit down, prioritize the projects and come up with it.

Alderman Hirschmann asked are you committed to the million dollars of school maintenance...that \$115 million number also includes \$850,000 of deficit reduction, do you agree with that, Mr. Finance Chairman.

School Committee Member Cook replied no, the \$115 million does not include...

Alderman Hirschmann interjected then we cannot vote on this number tonight, Mr. Wihby.

School Committee Member Cook stated the \$850,000 was in the Mayor's budget, not in the School budget for a reduction in the deficit. As I understand the budget...

Alderman Hirschmann interjected it's included in this number, Sir.

School Committee Member Cook stated it's come out of there, it certainly didn't go into ours, I don't believe.

Mayor Baines stated as I understand, if I could just clarify...would you like me to.

Alderman Hirschmann replied clarify it, your Honor.

Mayor Baines stated it is my understanding, Mr. Clougherty, that they are going to have to come up with a plan to pay that back and it doesn't have to be all in the first year, is that correct.

Mr. Clougherty replied that is the plan you made.

Alderman Hirschmann stated so we're going to carry no number, they are going to come up with a plan someday to pay us some amount.

School Committee Member Cook stated I believe what is going to happen...as far as I know no request has come to the School Board from anybody to come up with that plan although when I was here when we were talking about the budget I noted that we would have to do that. My expectation is is that if the...and this is just my expectation...we have not discussed this. But, my expectation is that the \$850,000 that the Mayor carried in his budget as a partial payment on the deficit is not included in the budget; that we will have to give you a plan that uses our excess revenue, you'd have to approve it obviously because any excess revenue we have you have to vote for. But, our excess revenue would have to be used to pay off the thing and it would take a longer period of time if the \$850,000 is not there than if the \$850,000 was there.

Mayor Baines asked is that correct, Mr. Clougherty.

Mr. Clougherty replied yes because as excess revenue basically is going to fund to his fund balance and that's what we've been talking about.

School Committee Member Cook stated that is what we would have to use.

Alderman Wihby stated that is not necessarily true because if this Board doesn't appropriate the excess revenues then you're still going to have to come up with a plan for

any deficit that you have over the years. The School Department...do you agree that the School Department is responsible for any deficits that they make, do you agree with that.

School Committee Member Cook replied I agree with that.

Alderman Wihby stated so as long as you're responsible for it you've got to come up with a plan that's going to take care of any deficits from any future years...this year's, last year's...whatever numbers they are.

School Committee Member Cook stated my expectation, Alderman, is that we will be discussing a plan either with the group that's going to meet and talk about school issues that are under the declaratory judgement or separately and as we did the last time that we faced this situation we worked out a solution together and we've come to our respective boards together and we'll solve the problems together.

Alderman Wihby stated it doesn't necessarily mean that it's coming from excess revenues that you're going to be appropriated those excess revenues.

School Committee Member Cook stated you have to approve any solution we come up with.

Alderman Levasseur stated, Alderman Hirschmann, thank you for flushing that out because there's another whole issue that we probably wouldn't have realized...we're sitting here in front of the Chairman of the Finance Committee...we've had two deficits in a row of \$1.9 million and we're talking advice from the Chairman of Finance and somewhere along the line my friends we had a court order and were going to court to have a clarification on the court order. This Board voted to send that issue to court, we voted and then the school's decided to jump in on that also. But, in the meantime, they stopped going to court and now it's somewhere in mediation. So, we don't even know what the court order is going to come out to, we don't know what the judge would have said. They're going to be negotiating among themselves about what kind of a payback there is going to be, so I'm starting to think now that the million dollars is added to their budget so that there is going to be able to pay back some more money to us. This is really starting to look crazy. You don't have to go all the way to Denmark to smell something rotten in this town.

Mayor Baines stated let me just explain. When Alderman Wihby talked about this at the last meeting it was very clear that this issue was part of the thing being turned back to the School and talked very specifically about the \$850,000 we had taken out and that it would become the responsibility of the schools.

Alderman Hirschmann interjected we were under the assumption that it dealt with this budget; that was how it was portrayed...taken out of your budget and it was going to be covered in this number. So, it almost made this number believable, but now it's not.

Alderman Wihby stated I was very clear when I presented it that I said that they were going to have to be responsible for the deficit and then come up with a plan to pay for it and I specifically said they could do it in one or two years, but that they would have to come up with a plan...they're responsible for it and if they're responsible for it it shouldn't be on the City side of the budget.

Alderman Hirschmann stated now that I understand it, that's your plan and I'm not voting for it.

Alderman Wihby stated this Board still has a say in appropriating additional funds and if you don't they still are responsible for the deficit.

Alderman Levasseur stated I would have felt very good about this because I thought we were going in the right direction, your Honor, when you decided to take this to court and I thought it was the prudent move so that we could have...I don't like this opening up to the interpretation of the attorneys because they decide they want to mediate this. The fact is that the School Board never would have given into take this out of court unless they thought they were going to lose. Now, we have made tons of plans with the School Board that we are going to work things out and, your Honor, when you first began here I thought that was going to happen. The first year went by they didn't get worked out, the second year is going by...they haven't been worked out...we're under a new election right now who knows who's going to be coming in on the next Board. This is ridiculous the way this is going on, we should have never allowed this to come out of the court, we should have come down with a strong ruling and then we could have made a decision on what we were going to do and if we needed to make an appeal.

Alderman Vaillancourt stated having heard that there was \$850,000 cut that would have been more than the half-a-percent I requested, so I could have voted for this, but now it sounds like the School Board doesn't have any obligation to do anything this year. If you give them two years they may give you ten bucks this year and \$849,990 next year, but while Mr. Cook was up there I want to ask him another question...it's not \$850,000 but there's another little item that will appear on the budget for the City later, namely...and I wonder if Mr. Cook could tell the Tax Collector if the School is going to fund \$37,071 for an employee in the Tax Collector's Office since as I understand it that position will only become effective, Alderman Wihby, if the School agrees to fund this.

Alderman Wihby stated what's in front of you is that's true...there's a change...the new sheet that was passed out today that's corrected and it's no longer counting on their chargeback number.

Alderman Vaillancourt asked so that is an extra \$37,000 we're giving the School Board.

Alderman Wihby replied no that is an extra \$37,000 you're giving the Tax Collector.

Alderman Vaillancourt stated so the School Board doesn't have to come up with that \$37,000.

Alderman Wihby replied that is correct.

Alderman Vaillancourt stated so I assume the answer is they have absolutely no intention of coming up with it then.

Alderman Wihby stated I imagine he's going to tell you that.

Alderman Vaillancourt asked why did you change then. I guess the question to you is why did you decide not to ask to come up with that.

Alderman Wihby asked "the school".

Alderman Vaillancourt replied right, that was the plan when we left here one week ago.

Alderman Wihby stated a couple of Aldermen called and asked why we were tying it to the Tax Collector when there's a long line out there right now for residents and it wasn't necessarily because of the schools. In the new number I took the chargeback number out and that is one of the things we're going to discuss tonight.

Alderman Gatsas stated, Alderman Vaillancourt, I'll take the blame for that because I believe that that is one of the biggest revenue departments we have and I believe that to sit there and tell somebody that they shouldn't have one additional person when we have citizens in this City looking to pay bills waiting an hour doesn't make any sense and it shouldn't be tied to the School Board or the School Department at all.

Alderman Vaillancourt interjected I agree with you, I just think we should take the \$37,000 out of the School budget to make up for it then.

School Committee Member Cook asked, Mayor, am I done.

Mayor Baines replied why don't you just stay there.

Alderman Gatsas stated maybe you could help me with this, Mr. Cook. I don't believe that it was the City that first brought the lawsuit to court in this most recent effort, was it.

School Committee Member Cook replied I think that's correct.

Alderman Gatsas stated it was the School Department that engaged the filing first.

School Committee Member Cook replied I believe that is correct.

Alderman Gatsas stated so Alderman Levasseur misspoke when he said it was the City that went first.

School Committee Member Cook stated I think what he meant was the City...if I could and believe me I don't speak for him, but I believe this Board voted to proceed to court first...the fact that our filing...and we voted to also get issues clarified...I believe our filing was made in the court first, but I believe you made the decision to go to court first.

Alderman Gatsas stated the deficit that we talked about in the budget process for the audit report of this year (2000) that money is funded no where by the City.

School Committee Member Cook stated the deficit in the School budget has to be covered by appropriated revenues appropriated by this Board from whatever source. There are only two places it can come from...there's three places it can come from. It can come from revenues that we have that we ask you to appropriate toward the deficit, it can come from other revenues...those revenues that the Mayor put in his budget or it can come from someplace else. But, those are the two primary places it can come from.

Alderman Gatsas stated at this time there is no plan for the \$3.2 million...

School Committee Member Gatsas interjected it's \$2.0 million, I believe.

Alderman Gatsas asked does that include the \$850,000.

School Committee Member Gatsas asked what \$850,000.

Alderman Gatsas replied the \$850,00, I believe, from this year we appropriated to you for the over expenditure.

School Committee Member Cook stated the \$850,000 was part of the number that took the \$3.6 down to the \$2.0. Okay, I see where you are.

Alderman Gatsas stated the total would be \$2.8.

School Committee Member Cook stated the total right now is about \$2.0 that we still have to deal with.

Alderman Gatsas stated not including the \$850,000.

School Committee Member Cook stated the \$850,000 that you previously appropriated was not there, it would be \$2.8.

Alderman Gatsas stated let's try it again.

School Committee Member Cook stated you appropriated the \$850,000, we have it, therefore, the amount we still have to cover is \$2.0.

Alderman Gatsas asked, Kevin, is that true.

Mr. Clougherty replied yes.

Alderman Gatsas stated that is the first time I've ever gotten a yes or no question answered that quickly. I believe as I said previously it's either \$115. or \$114., I don't think anybody on this Board can be upset. If anybody votes on the School Department tomorrow in Building and Sites to move that money to a different project we have no control. Why are we even looking at projects with dollars on them. Either we want to give them \$115. or we want to give them \$114., it should not have to do with projects that we're dictating where that money is going to go and that is what it looks like and we shouldn't be doing that. Maybe we can request and maybe we can ask, but it shouldn't be attached to a project.

Mayor Baines stated the other thing is we do have cooperative relationships between departments and the schools such as the Health Department, as an example...the nurses and others that there is that kind of a commitment to meet it. So, I think there is a history of this relationship with Public Building Services especially since Frank has taken over there that they've built up a spirit of trust and commitment to fix these buildings and I don't see anyone backing away from that commitment. Now, having said that you're absolutely correct...that could happen, but we don't expect that to happen.

Alderman Levasseur stated, your Honor, there is another point to clarify that. It's still a million dollars in cash, it's not bondable money. We could take that money and keep it for ourselves for some other project if we wanted to. But, because we're giving them that one million dollars that is where the issue is...it's whether who wants to make sure these projects are done, that's it.

Alderman Shea stated just to go back to what my colleague here mentioned, I think Joan Porter sent us a letter on June 6th saying "first I would like to thank you for acknowledging the need for a position in the Tax Collector's Office to better serve the public. I'd request that this not be tied to a chargeback to the School District. I would like these to be two separate issues. So, that clarifies that particular...

Alderman Cashin moved to the question. Alderman Lopez duly seconded the motion. The motion carried with Aldermen Vaillancourt and Hirschmann duly recorded in opposition.

Alderman Vaillancourt asked would you accept a further amendment to reduce by \$37,071.

Mayor Baines replied no. It is my understanding that we have moved the question now...we have to vote on the question.

Alderman Wihby moved that the Resolution pass and be Enrolled as amended. Alderman Lopez duly seconded the motion. The motion carried with Aldermen Levasseur, Vaillancourt and Hirschmann duly recorded in opposition.

13. Appropriating Resolution:

“Appropriating all Incremental Meals and Rooms Tax Revenue Received by the City in Fiscal Year 2001 and held in the Civic Center Fund, for the payment of the City's Obligations in Said Fiscal Year Under the Financing Agreement.”

On motion of Alderman Thibault, duly seconded by Alderman Pariseau, it was voted that the Resolution be read by title only and it was so done.

Alderman O'Neil moved that the Resolution pass and be Enrolled. Alderman Lopez duly seconded the motion. The motion carried with Alderman Shea and Vaillancourt duly recorded in opposition.

14. Appropriating Resolution:

“Amending a Resolution ‘A Resolution appropriating to the Manchester Transit Authority the sum of \$705,000 for the Fiscal Year 2002’ to \$725,000.”

Alderman Wihby moved that the Resolution be read by title only. Alderman Pariseau duly seconded the motion. The motion carried with Alderman Gatsas duly recorded in opposition.

Alderman Pariseau moved that the Resolution pass and be Enrolled. Alderman Thibault duly seconded the motion. Mayor Baines called for a vote on the motion.

Alderman Gatsas, Shea and Vaillancourt were duly recorded in opposition.

Deputy Clerk Johnson stated we do not have enough votes to pass this Resolution. This particular Resolution requires a two-thirds majority vote which would be ten votes of the Board.

Mayor Baines asked what is the ramification of this not passing.

Deputy Clerk Johnson replied there is no appropriation for the Transit Authority.

Alderman Levasseur asked point of clarification, your Honor. When we had 13 people here one night we did not need ten, we needed nine...that is how the principals contract got passed, so does the number get reduced by that number that we did the last time.

Mayor Baines stated the City Solicitor will advise the Board.

Solicitor Clark stated no, the statute that governs the MTA states that it takes a two-thirds majority of the Board-elect.

Mayor Baines stated so the ramifications of this not passing tonight, as of July 1 the Transit Authority...

Alderman Vaillancourt interjected we'll pass something...we'll just amend it.

Alderman Gatsas stated if I remember correctly the medical plan is paid for at 100% for all management...I remember having to review the tape because I was not here that evening. I will move that they are in the same position as the rest of the City employees, that they will pay the same proportionate share for their medical insurance.

Mayor Baines stated I don't think I can't accept that, I don't think we can do that.

Solicitor Clark stated you can't dictate to them, they are a separate municipal corporation governed by their own board. You can cut their appropriation, but you can't dictate what they do in administration.

Alderman Cashin stated we can't do it but we can certainly write a memo to the MTA Commission telling them that we don't appreciate it and we want it knocked off. Can we do that.

Solicitor Clark replied you certainly have the authority to give a recommendation to them, sure.

Alderman Gatsas stated clarification from the City Solicitor. Can we appropriate less money and have them come back and reappropriate the difference. In other words, can we appropriate them \$650,000 and then change that at a later date to \$705,000...

Alderman Pariseau interjected \$725,000 is taking care of transportation for...

Solicitor Clark stated you can reduce their appropriation, the number is up to you. To do a supplemental appropriation in the City you have to have excess revenues that are certified by the Finance Officer that is the only supplemental appropriation you can do.

Mayor Baines stated also if we reduce our subsidy...

Alderman Gatsas stated if we put that in contingency...

Solicitor Clark interjected I believe you've already passed that budget though...you can put it in contingency and transfer it later, yes.

Mayor Baines stated it is my understanding that our appropriation reduces then their federal subsidy also reduces as well, am I correct in that.

Mr. Clougherty replied that is my understanding as well.

Alderman Gatsas stated I think we are sending them a clear message. It has nothing to do with...

Mayor Baines asked what are you going to appropriate.

Alderman Gatsas replied the sum is \$705,000 and if we reduce it by \$30,000 and take it to \$675,000, take the \$30,000 and put it in contingency subject to them...is the number \$705,000 or \$725,000.

Deputy Clerk Johnson replied \$725,000.

Alderman Gatsas stated take out \$50,000...it's \$675,000, put the \$50,000 in contingency with the understanding that they change their allocation of the medical distribution payments by the top management to follow the suit of the same thing as the rest of the City employees, we will take the money out of contingency and put it back.

Mayor Baines stated what we would need for a motion is "Amending a Resolution appropriating to the Manchester Transit Authority the sum of \$675,000...

Deputy Clerk Johnson stated a motion to amend the Resolution to \$675,000 is, I believe, what Alderman Gatsas...

Mayor Baines asked don't we have to include the contingency in that resolution. How do we deal with the contingency.

Deputy Clerk Johnson replied the contingency will be appropriated through a different resolution, it will be under the general fund resolution.

Mayor Baines stated so we have an amended Resolution of \$675,000 for the MTA, correct...motion, is that correct.

Deputy Clerk Johnson replied we need a motion to amend it to that amount.

Alderman Gatsas moved to amend the Resolution downward to \$675,000. Alderman Shea duly seconded the motion.

Alderman O'Neil stated a question for Alderman Gatsas. Is your intent the same as their employees or City employees and the only reason I ask I'm not clear that they're employees have the same contribution that the balance of City employees do, I don't know that. Do you want everybody at the Transit Authority contributing the same.

Alderman Gatsas replied absolutely.

Alderman Levasseur asked does the amendment also need a two-thirds majority because I'm going to vote against it, so you're not going to have that amendment anyway, I'm just telling you that right now. I don't believe that we should be playing around with deciding what people's insurance...without anybody from the bus company being here.

Mayor Baines recessed the meeting to allow staff to meet.

Mayor Baines called the meeting back to order.

Mayor Baines stated the Clerk will offer a suggestion that allows us to accomplish the same thing, but do it legally and accomplish what we need to accomplish.

Deputy Clerk Johnson stated the first thing I would like to do is request that the former motion that was on the floor to amend the Resolution to \$675,000 be withdrawn.

Alderman Gatsas withdrew his motion to amend the Resolution. Alderman Shea withdrew his second.

Deputy Clerk Johnson stated after conversing with the Finance Officer and the City Solicitor the suggestion has been made that a similar situation to that which was done with the Aggregation Program be done with this Resolution which would place a restriction on the Resolution that they can only spend up to \$675,000...they must return to the Board for expenditure any additional appropriation. So, the Resolution will still read at \$725,000, but the recommendation is to amend the Resolution to place that restriction on it.

Alderman Gatsas moved to amend the Resolution by placing the restriction that expenditures exceeding a total of \$675,000 subject to approval by the Board of Mayor and Aldermen prior to expenditure. Alderman Pariseau duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Vaillancourt stated serendipity does not reign supreme. I think my colleague from Ward 7 and I were not opposing this for the same reason as my colleague from Ward 2, so I think it should be said that the reason we oppose this had nothing to do with insurance although I think that's probably a good point. But, I personally, and I think I can speak for Alderman Shea oppose this because of the \$20,000 amendment that had been added in for the civic center shuttle bus which I said at the time and want to repeat again I don't think makes any sense at all, it's not good policy planning. But, if we had a few more people sick you'd actually need our votes.

Alderman Lopez stated just one question of the City Solicitor. Does this have to be completed by June 30th in order for them to apply for their full funding from the federal government.

Solicitor Clark replied I don't know what their deadline is for funding to the federal government.

Alderman Lopez stated I just want to be assured that the City is not going to be losing the money, I don't mind the motion. I just want to be sure, so will that be checked out to make sure that we have to come back here to make sure that this is done before June 30th.

Mayor Baines stated if we need to, I will call the Board back, but we are giving the full appropriation.

Alderman Levasseur stated it's kind of amazing that we're about to make a decision on eleven managers...compensation package, not knowing whether they're paid reasonably well or if they're in comparison with other City employees for the management that they

are doing. We don't know if some of those managers are making \$40,000 while some of the managers on our side, the City side are making \$60,000 and the fact that they don't have to pay for insurance compensates them in a different way and we're doing this even though they themselves have their own commission, they are their own separate entity and they should be making that decision upon themselves. To send a strong message to them that we would like to pay for their own insurance or pay a portion thereof, I think is strong enough so that if they came before this Board another time and I already know that the members of the commission, your Honor, had spoken to us about this and said yes that they would look at that and make some kind of a decision on that, but to make a decision like this without even conferring with them, to have them in front of us to talk about them...the economy right now is so strong even though they're laying off all of the people in the web market, we don't know if maybe there's just a couple of these guys who are going to be ticked off about the fact that we decided to take away their insurance on them and then they decide to quit and leave that place...which is already having a problem finding employees with more of a problem. I don't think this is the proper message to send to them and I don't think we should be pulling this kind of a switch on them in the last minute when they have already come before us expecting that money. So, I will vote against that, your Honor.

Mayor Baines called for a vote on the motion.

Alderman Vaillancourt stated maybe we should have a roll call, your Honor.

Mayor Baines responded if you'd like one, Alderman.

Alderman Levasseur asked what would be the amount of votes you would need to get this in, would it need another two-thirds.

Deputy Clerk Johnson replied ten.

Alderman Levasseur asked how many are here.

A roll call vote was taken on the motion to amend the Resolution by placing the restriction that expenditures exceeding a total of \$675,000 subject to approval by the Board of Mayor and Aldermen prior to expenditure. Alderman Vaillancourt, Pariseau, Cashin, Thibault, Hirschmann, Wihby, Gatsas, Pinard, O'Neil, Lopez and Shea voted yea. Alderman Levasseur voted nay. Aldermen Sysyn and Clancy were absent, the motion carried.

Deputy Clerk Johnson asked if the Board wished to take up the CIP Resolution first because the CIP number is included in the City's Appropriating Resolution.

TABLED ITEM

Alderman Pariseau moved to remove the following item from the table for discussion.
Alderman Shea duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

17. Appropriating Resolution:

"Amending a Resolution 'Approving the Community Improvement Program for 2002, Raising and Appropriating Monies Therefore and Authorizing Implementation of Said Program'."

(Tabled 06/05/01)

On motion of Alderman Thibault, duly seconded by Alderman Lopez, it was voted that the Resolution be read by title only, and it was so done.

Deputy Clerk Johnson stated the \$1,790,742 is being proposed for the cash tables. At a meeting of the Board there was a million dollars that was moved over to the School District which was reduced back, so it's actually a \$964,000. There were some actions previously in CIP that brought the number up on the cash side from what the Mayor had originally placed. The difference between all of those numbers based on current Board actions would be the \$1,790,742...there are two items on Table 2 that would need to be changed. One is the School Capital Improvement Program...reduced by the \$964,000 and would now read \$36,000 and removing \$.76 from the Parks Improvement to round out the numbers. Those are the two differences that would go into the Resolution based on the motion to amend.

Alderman O'Neil stated he would like to further amend the CIP Resolution.

Deputy Clerk Johnson stated why not get this action taken and then we will deal with the other matter (amendment) because that is a different table. Alderman O'Neil so concurred. Deputy Clerk Johnson advised the motion would be to amend the CIP Cash amount to \$1,790,742 by amending the two projects previously mentioned...one by \$.76 and one by reducing it by \$964,000.

Alderman Wibby moved to amend the Resolution as outlined by the Clerk. Alderman Shea duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Deputy Clerk Johnson stated the second proposed amendment has been brought in through a distribution through Alderman O'Neil and it's talking about reallocation of \$50,000 in the proposed FY02 CIP budget from PAL Project to the Beech Street School

Project. The motion would be to decrease the PAL Center Renovations Project from \$100,000 to \$50,000 and to add a new project Beech Street School Playground in the amount of \$50,000 which would be in Table 2 CDBG funds. She noted that it does not change the bottom line of those funds.

Alderman O'Neil stated Alderman Clancy had brought it up at the last full Board meeting. He and I attended a meeting last week. For whatever the reason, we were asked way back to approve \$210,000...the price actually came in at \$313,000...whether parts of it were added or not, it's going to be tough to find out the staff and the kids at Beech Street...this playground should have been done last September. By not approving this money it is going to continue to delay getting this project done. I met with Bob and we approached the PAL Board of Directors with regard to less funding...they voted and approved it and this will get this project done for the kids at Beech Street School that's been dragging on and I would ask your support of this.

Alderman O'Neil moved to decrease the PAL Center Renovations Project from \$100,000 to \$50,000 and to add a new project Beech Street School Playground in the amount of \$50,000; such changes to be reflected in Table 2 CDBG funds. Alderman Pariseau duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Alderman O'Neil stated I'd like to thank the Traffic Department and the Highway Department stepping up to help \$25,000 on this project.

Alderman Lopez moved that the Resolution pass and be Enrolled as amended. Alderman Pariseau duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

15. Appropriating Resolution:

“Amending a Resolution ‘Raising Monies and Making Appropriations for the Fiscal Year 2002’ to \$102,383,154.”

On motion of Alderman Pariseau, duly seconded by Alderman Thibault, it was voted that the Resolution be read by title only, and it was so done.

Alderman Wihby in reference to the new handout stated on the right hand side where there is the dark, old writing are the changes from the last time we met. Basically, these are numbers that if you look through all of the department's requests and some of the things that were in there and some of the errors that occurred...Leo Bernier's letter about the Aldermen (adding back the health number); the Assessor's asking for the A-step; Building for a mistake that was made in their calculation; the \$125,000 for expense and the \$125,000 for revenue which is an offset from Finance and maybe Kevin could explain that. I think that was something that the bonding people wanted.

Mr. Clougherty stated that is to make a change in the way that we're paying some of our banking fees.

Alderman Wihby stated add \$33,000 for the custodian...moving the custodian from Highway back under the City Clerk's Office and the \$34,000 from the NESN number increase which was actually \$49,000, but there were some negatives to that, so we made it \$34,000.

Alderman Vaillancourt stated I just wanted to check and make sure that that's \$1.40 a month, but as I understand it the people that subscribe to NESN now pay \$10.00 a month...do we have any authority that they are going to get \$34,000 more. I think this is a wash, if anything, we might actually lose money.

Alderman Wihby stated Leo spoke to them and they gave us a number of \$49,000 minus a few NESN customers, but they said there were very few customers.

Alderman Vaillancourt stated so we don't have the 10% average that NESN has New England wide.

Clerk Bernier replied no, that is the number we received.

Alderman Wihby continued by stating Youth Services was \$1,000 for some expense...I think they were asking for \$2,500 back...\$20,000 was the benefits number that we mistakenly took out of HR...again, to take out the custodian out of PBS. What we did with Fire...there was \$68,000, if you read the Fire Chief's letter... \$68,000 in the MER account for equipment.

Alderman Pariseau asked where is that letter, Alderman Wihby.

Alderman Wihby replied it came over the weekend, on Friday. We asked all of the departments what this meant on their budget and they all responded back.

Alderman Levasseur asked may I make a point first, your Honor.

Mayor Baines replied yes.

Alderman Levasseur stated that letter we got I thought was from Alderman O'Neil, not actually from the Chief, is that true.

Alderman Wihby stated there were two letters. The Chief was asking for additional funds and then Alderman O'Neil talked about the \$68,000 that the Chief had talked about.

Basically, this is just to take the \$68,000 out of the MER account which was used for equipment, put it into the Fire Department budget and let him decide and run his department accordingly. If he thinks he has enough money to buy those two vehicles, fine. If he thinks he needs it for the operation of the department, he can use it for the operation of the department. It's something to give back out of the half-a-percent that we had and giving him a little leeway to solving his problem with the operations of the department.

Alderman Levasseur stated I'm just a little confused as to the operation. The letter that I see is to add three more District Chiefs and I thought that the Chief said he didn't need them, but now they are saying that they do. So, I was just a little confused by that because I wasn't at that first meeting where that whole thing was discussed, but I was under the assumption that the Chief said they were too top heavy and they didn't need them, but now it's changed. So, the \$68,000 that was going to go for vehicles would now go towards an upgrade of the positions...doesn't that have to go through Human Resources.

Alderman Wihby stated that is not what the \$68,000 is.

Alderman Levasseur stated he can use it any way he wants, right.

Alderman Hirschmann stated he can use the money for expenses of vehicles, he doesn't have the authority to put on District Chiefs...that has to be a vote of the full Board.

Alderman Levasseur asked are you sure.

Alderman Hirschmann replied I'm sure.

Alderman Levasseur asked is that true. I'd like to make a point. I thought that it went through Human Resources or is that a different kind of a position.

Alderman Lopez replied I think the process would be that the Chief would go to the Mayor and ask to put three District Chiefs on and then the Mayor would bring it before this Board.

Mayor Baines stated the Board would get involved in that process. Alderman Wihby why don't you explain it for everybody.

Alderman Wihby stated basically this wasn't getting into the Chief problem at all or adding the Chiefs. This was basically to try to alleviate the problem of his expenses on his operational side, so if he has the money he'll use it for equipment, for two cars, and if

he doesn't have the money he'll use it to operate the department, but it's not getting into the question as far as the Chiefs.

Alderman Hirschmann stated I advocate to give the Chief the money and I'll tell you why. I really don't want to see the Fire Chief leaving firefighter positions vacant, so he can make his budget each year. This \$150,000 will help the Chief put the appropriate number of firefighters on and pay the expenses.

Alderman Levasseur stated you added the \$150,000 which I don't have a problem with, but then there is an additional \$68,000. We already added back in the \$150,000, Alderman, so that you could fill those positions. The letter says specifically "a suggestion would be that we move this money to the Fire Department operating budget in order to return the number of District Chiefs to a full complement of nine from their current level six. Please note that this would be phased in during the fiscal year and is not anticipated to take effect until January of 2002." That is what the letter specifically states and I don't have a problem with the \$150,000, it's the additional \$68,000 because like I said you're already giving them the money and then you're saying here's the money and then come back later with the approval. Why don't we just do it tonight.

Alderman Wihby stated you're reading the wrong letter. I'm reading the letter from Joe Kane.

Alderman Levasseur asked how much more different is that one from this one.

Alderman Wihby replied it says "we would ask that you consider restoring the half-a-percent cut to our appropriation.

Alderman Levasseur stated and you did...

Alderman Wihby stated no we didn't.

Alderman Cashin stated Chief Kane is here, do you want to ask him to come up.

Alderman Levasseur stated I don't have a problem with the position, let's call it what it is, let's do it right.

Chief Kane stated Alderman Wihby was right. The letter that you have is not from me, the letter that I sent was asking to restore the half-a-percent...there's a different letter...

Alderman Vaillancourt asked do you agree with the statement in Alderman O'Neil's letter dated June 8th that you've indicated that your concern is the need for additional monies, etc. and then this sentence "he (meaning you) has also indicated that if these items were

addressed he would support the return of the District Chiefs." Do you agree with that statement.

Chief Kane replied yes, I do.

Alderman Vaillancourt stated so you are asking for this money for additional Chiefs.

Chief Kane stated what occurred was we requested \$150,000 which the Aldermen did put that money in, but on the other hand they took a half-a-percent out which was \$84,000. I sent a letter requesting that half-a-percent be put back in, that was my request.

Mayor Baines stated let Alderman O'Neil clarify.

Alderman O'Neil stated my understanding, Alderman Wihby...my suggestion of \$68,000 for the District Chiefs...you have taken and are recommending it go toward operating expenses of the department, correct.

Alderman Wihby stated to come back at the \$85,000 he was needing.

Alderman Vaillancourt stated my question is quite simple. I'm not going to support three additional Chiefs because we're talking about doing this not just for this portion of a year which is perhaps capable to do for that small portion of the year with \$68,000, but we're locking ourselves into a couple of hundred thousand dollars into the future. So, if this passes the way it is...the bottom line question is do we get the three more Chiefs or not.

Chief Kane replied as I understand it...for that process to occur, I would have to go through the Mayor's Office and come back to the Board.

Mayor Baines stated the Chief would have to come back and say that he's making some different priorities and would have to come back to the Board. We are putting the money in to deal with the operational expenses of that department.

Alderman Levasseur asked are you planning on coming into the Board, I think is the question.

Alderman Vaillancourt stated that is the question, yes. Do you plan on coming back to the Board and saying I want three more District Chiefs, not only this year, but every year out into the future.

Chief Kane replied this has just been presented to me tonight for the first time. This is the first time I've seen it. I would have to look at the budget to see what the impact is on

my department to see if that would be feasible...that is a proposal that has been brought up, but at this point in time I am not doing that.

Alderman Vaillancourt stated so the line from Alderman O'Neil's letter indicating that you would support this is not true.

Chief Kane replied that is true. I do support putting the District Chiefs back in, but I also recognize that it has to be fiscally responsible and that I need the approval of this Board to do that.

Alderman Shea stated, Chief Kane, your need is for protective clothing, vehicle rust repair, equipment and so forth, is that correct.

Chief Kane replied that is correct.

Alderman Shea stated the second point is that you are going to be adding a new fire station within the next year or so and at that time you probably will need additional District Chief Assistants, namely, right now you're running at a situation where some of the District Chiefs have to work overtime and so forth, is that correct.

Chief Kane replied that is correct.

Alderman Shea stated so when you come before the Board you'll have justification for adding District Chiefs into your personnel.

Chief Kane replied that would be correct.

Alderman O'Neil stated if I understand what Alderman Wihby's done here, he's given them the \$150,000, but then with the half-a-percent cut that brings that number down to \$65,662, correct Alderman Wihby.

Alderman Wihby replied the half-a-percent cut was \$84,338.

Alderman O'Neil asked is that the balance left.

Alderman Wihby replied no, the \$62,000.

Alderman O'Neil stated the \$65,662. Then you've taken the \$68,000 added it to the \$65,000 to bring his operating expense number up to \$130,000 something, whatever that adds up to, correct.

Alderman Wihby replied correct. A follow-up...my understanding with the question that was asked of the Chief was, I think the philosophy is that he does want the Chiefs back, he never wanted to give them up in the first place anyway. But, I think the budget was first and if in fact he had to put in money, he wanted to take care of the items that Alderman Shea had talked about first and then if there was anything left over he proceeds to this Board for permission to do something different. So, the outcome was the number that we put in.

Alderman Levasseur stated we could take that \$68,000 and put it in contingency and they could come back to us if they needed it. This money is going to be put in there specifically for the reason to bring in these new positions. I can't believe you can sit there and tell us...you've got a letter dated June 8th here and it was addressed to you, Chief. I don't have a problem with this. If you wanted to bring in these new positions and you wanted to up them, I don't even know what the problem is, nobody ever talked to me about it. We could just take a vote on it. I don't understand why it has to be done like this. What this line says here, Alderman Wihby, "add \$150,000 in expenses prior to the \$68,000 from the MER account." That was the half-a-percent deduction.

Alderman Wihby stated what we did in the last budget was that we added \$150,000 and this Board approved that \$150,000. All we're looking at for additions today to Fire is taking the \$68,000 from his two cars, I guess they were, leaving it in his budget and letting him decide whether he wants the cars or if he wants it for the operations of his department. We're not voting for Chiefs or it has nothing to do with Chiefs, this Board is going to decide Chiefs later on if he ever comes forward with it and it takes another vote.

Alderman Levasseur stated all I have for my question basically is this, is the \$150,000 and additional \$68,000 which isn't only \$150,000, it's adding another \$218,000. Is that right or is that not right.

Chief Kane stated in that equation there is \$150,000 plus the \$68,000...but then there is a minus \$84,000; that is what you are missing.

Alderman Levasseur stated the \$84,000...I thought the \$150,000 was after the \$84,000.

Chief Kane replied no. You added \$150,000 on one hand and then you took out \$84,000 off on the other hand.

Alderman O'Neil stated again what I understand is going on here is the net...when we get through all of this...for operating expenses to the Fire Department is \$133,662, correct.

Chief Kane replied that is correct.

Alderman Hirschmann stated that is precisely what I thought. You're counting two numbers but you weren't coming to the net. This number will just get him by his expense side and make sure that those vacant positions are filled with firefighters and run his department.

Alderman Vaillancourt stated I agree with Alderman Hirschmann that nobody wants to deny that, but I have a question for Aldermen Wihby and Hirschmann...if we pass this do you expect the three additional Chiefs to be with us.

Alderman Hirschmann replied no.

Alderman Vaillancourt stated okay then I will take you at your word.

Alderman Levasseur asked I have one more point of clarification before we go on.

Alderman Shea had stated that the Fire Department...the building would be up in a year...is that true. I thought we only appropriate a third of the money that you needed to have that building built, I thought it was a \$3 million building. Can I have that question answered.

Mayor Baines stated we need a motion to amend....

Alderman Levasseur asked can I have that question answered.

Mayor Baines stated I'm sorry I missed that because we were trying to clarify the motion.

Alderman Levasseur reiterated that Alderman Shea had stated that the new building for the fire station would be done in a year, I thought it was only a third funded.

Alderman Pariseau replied it's a year-and-a-half.

Mr. MacKenzie stated there's additional monies needed for the fire station.

Alderman Hirschmann moved to amend the Appropriating Resolution to \$103,039,247.

Alderman Pariseau duly seconded the motion.

Mayor Baines asked the Clerk to clarify the motion to be placed on the floor.

Deputy Clerk Johnson stated Alderman Wihby distributed a FY2002 budget with new breakdowns and figures. If you look at that on the line that says grand total there is \$103,039,247; that would be the number that you would be amending the Resolution to in total which would give you the breakdown that is listed above.

Alderman Levasseur stated we haven't gone through each line...I'd like him to continue with the way he's going. I'm not going to just amend the whole thing now.

Alderman Wihby stated I guess that is why I didn't move the motion in the first place until we have discussion and then move the number.

Alderman Levasseur stated the motion is now on the floor.

Mayor Baines stated yes, the motion is on the floor now we will discuss it.

Alderman Wihby stated at Alderman Hirschmann's urging when we had the discussion last time...\$60,000 for the Community Police and then a memo from the Chief that stated that he needed \$29,650 to add the Parking Control Officers. We added Health...in the letters that he sent us basically was a wash, it was for the nurses; that is what that expense is there for the additional nurse increases; Highway...we made a calculation on a half-a-percent cut based on everything and it should have been only a half-a-percent cut based on everything other than the contract items, so that is what the \$42,000 is plus we added (at Alderman Levasseur's urging) \$200,000 for resurfacing; Traffic at the last meeting gave us a \$450,000 increase and the parking fines that we passed is another \$400,000 increase...

Alderman Levasseur stated, your Honor, this is the one I wanted to talk about now. I'm glad you went up with that number, I think you were correct but the \$250,000 that they're adding for traffic fines scares me because that needs to go to Accounts before it can be fully approved, your Honor, and I get the feeling that that is not going to make it. I wasn't there because it went through Traffic...the parking fines are going to go from (I think) \$5.00 or whatever...they're kind of outrageous, so I'm a little bit nervous about putting that number in before it's been approved, Alderman Wihby, I don't know what you want to do about that.

Alderman Wihby stated my understanding was that it was approved by one committee.

Alderman Levasseur stated I thought it had to go to Accounts.

Alderman Wihby stated it has to go to Accounts, but it's got to come back to the full Board, so you have one committee probably voting no and one committee voting yes. It's going to take the majority of the votes, but I think the biggest concern...it passed Traffic...but, the biggest concern, I think was what happened after a person was late, no so much what happened in the initial stages. They were just trying to get the rate equal so that it wasn't cheaper to pay a fine rather than park. So, that other issue that's still lingering out there wasn't talked about nor is it calculated in this number because I knew that might be a problem. Library...in his letter the one percent was \$11,007...I added

back the \$10,000 and the nurses reduced the chargeback where we talked about earlier about to Tax and we added \$1,424 back to Elderly Services which was basically food for elderly that she gave out...the minus \$964,000 again is that number that we talked about minus the \$36,000 plus we had to add \$42,342 for the problems that we had earlier minus the vehicles for Fire and the rest of the nurses, the maintenance number...that's it, your Honor, which basically what that does is I think when we were sitting down the last time we were talking about 2.97 or something and this brings it down to 2.64 (\$31.49) or I think it's an \$.81 increase.

Alderman Shea asked where do we stand with the Elderly Services, we were suppose to have a meeting with Lands and Buildings, but that didn't materialize, so are they going to stay on Hanover Street or...I think their rent is due by the 15th.

Alderman Cashin replied there's a meeting scheduled tomorrow night.

Alderman Shea stated I didn't know that.

Alderman Gatsas stated the senior discount we talked about or had conversation about a reduction in taxes and bringing the exemptions to the same level as Nashua, I noticed they're not in here and moved that that item be referred to the Committee on Administration so that we can look at it and talk about it.

Mayor Baines stated I would support that and ask if the Board get behind that after we deal with the budget numbers first.

Alderman Wihby stated the reason I didn't include it, your Honor, was because we don't have the numbers yet, but I know that Alderman Gatsas has been talking about it, but we didn't have any numbers yet, so we could send that as Alderman Gatsas recommends and if it does pass would affect the tax rate setting, but not the tax rate right now.

Mayor Baines asked does it matter if we pass that before the budget.

Mr. Clougherty stated Alderman Wihby is right. It will be part of the tax rate setting in the fall, if the Board takes action.

Mayor Baines asked do you have a problem with that.

Alderman Gatsas replied I don't have a problem as long as the Board agrees to send it to Administration and then we can deal with it there.

Mayor Baines stated why don't we deal with the amended budget situation and asked the Clerk to clarify for the Board.

Deputy Clerk Johnson stated at present there is a motion on the floor to amend the Resolution to \$103,039,247 and will deal with the other issue after.

Mayor Baines called for a vote on the motion.

Alderman Vaillancourt interjected aren't we discussing.

Mayor Baines stated I thought we had discussion, but if you'd like...

Alderman Vaillancourt stated gosh no, we're just beginning, your Honor, thank you very much. We've got a hundred million dollars here and we've got all of these lines I'd like to ask a few questions and delve into the tail onto some of this. First of all, I'd like to say that I agree that we should be adding \$200,000 for the Highway Department and I don't agree with adding much as most people know. But, whenever I get a call, oh I would say about 90% of the time it's not to say how we need this, this or this, but it's to say how we need better highway service. We need this street swept or we need a road paved or something and I do know that Hazelton Avenue was just paved and it's a world of difference to drive through. So, I do think that we should do as much as we can for the Highway Department and I'm glad that we're not hurting them, but it seems to be that this one-half-a-percent cut is now not universal...we decided not to cut the 1/2% from the School Department, we've basically added backed to Police and Fire and Highway and what else...yeah, the Library. Now, they're getting their...how much back...\$11,000 and that's because they claim they can't possibly do without that. Is that what I understand in the letter.

Alderman Wihby replied basically, Alderman, these changes were in answer to the letters they sent to the Aldermen...anybody can make motions to take something out if they don't agree with it. These are just in reference to the letters we got back from all of the departments.

Mayor Baines stated if you would like to offer an amendment to cut the half-a-percent from the Library we could deal with that right now.

Alderman Vaillancourt stated I'm not quite sure that it is a half-a-percent, it looks like \$10,000.

Alderman Wihby stated half-a-percent equaled \$11,788.

Alderman Vaillancourt stated you're adding back in \$10,000 instead of \$11,000.

Mayor Baines asked do you wish to make a motion.

Alderman Wihby stated this meant less staff...other departments said we'd work within it, we'll cut copying whatever...this was actual persons that they were cutting...Pages that they were cutting at the Library.

Alderman Vaillancourt stated you're not going to get much staff for \$10,000 are you.

Alderman Wihby replied that's 2.5 people.

Mayor Baines called for a vote on the motion to amend the Appropriating Resolution to \$103,039,247. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Alderman Wihby moved that the Appropriating Resolution pass and be Enrolled as amended. Alderman Pinard duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Alderman Gatsas moved that the Senior Discount Program be referred to the Committee on Administration. Alderman Cashin duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Hirschmann stated we spend all of this time and energy to try and get the tax rate down to 2.64% and now after we pass this we are going to talk about something in Committee that heavily impacts the tax rate. The Assessor's seem very worried when they were discussing the proposal for Manchester that the Elderly Exemptions that we give right now are fairly generous and some of these proposals on the table for the future are very high with asset limits, I'm just a little concerned, your Honor.

Mayor Baines stated this would go to Committee for study and something would have to come back to the Board to be voted on.

Alderman Levasseur stated I would think that since this is a Special Meeting of the Board that we would have to have a suspension of the rules in order to bring in something like that because that would be new business, wouldn't it; that is not something that's on our agenda tonight and it's also not something that's included in our budget. If you want to talk about that plan just bring it in at the regular meeting and we'll refer it down to a committee.

Mayor Baines stated I think it's budget related so the Chair would rule that that would be an appropriate motion because it is budget related.

Alderman Vaillancourt stated I have given this a great deal of thought and I'm not opposed to this because as you said it's just for discussion. I think what we should look at

doing, what we should try to do is to try and give some sort of relief this year, but not to the levels that were anticipated by some of the projections not go to the Nashua level because as the Assessor's have told us there really is no way of knowing what's going to happen if you increase those levels...what, up to \$75,000 for someone to apply...so, I think we should try to go a small step this year with the promise that if in fact it's not that detrimental overall we could go the rest of the way next year. So, I would urge the Committee as they look at that to try and take a small step in this direction, but not to try to do the whole thing in one year.

Mayor Baines called for a vote on the motion to refer the Senior Discount Program to the Committee on Administration.

A roll call vote was taken on the motion. Alderman Gatsas, Levasseur, Pinard, O'Neil, Lopez, Shea, Vaillancourt, Pariseau, Cashin, Thibault, Hirschmann and Wihby voted yea. Aldermen Sysyn and Clancy were absent. The motion carried.

Mayor Baines stated I would like to thank the Board for its hard work during the budget process, I felt a lot of teamwork was displayed throughout especially over the past few months, I think we've all worked very, very hard and putting in a lot of hours and I also want to thank the department heads in the City. We are very fortunate to have a group of hard working and dedicated department heads who work very, very hard with the Mayor and with the Board of Mayor and Aldermen to deliver a budget that was fair and prudent but preserved City services and allowed the City to continue to grow. So, I'd like to publicly commend all involved with the process and again let's work very hard. We're going to have to keep a very close watch over revenues as we progress into the year...we're committed to doing that and if we need to come back to the Board with some concern in that area I am sure we will bring it to your immediate attention. Again, thank you very much.

Alderman Levasseur stated, your Honor, in that same light that you're saying these congratulations and I really appreciate your saying that, but I think that this Board and I'd like to make this a public statement that a special thanks does go to Alderman Wihby for putting in all of this time and energy into this. He is the one who printed up all of these numbers, he's the one who worked day and night, he's the one who does a lot of the phone calls, he's the one who puts this into his computer and I think that I want to take as much congratulations as Alderman Wihby, but I could not do that. Alderman Wihby is unbelievable at these numbers and has worked very diligently and he's a very persuasive man to get us on board with these budgets. So, your Honor, if anybody needs...I don't like to single out anybody, but in this instance, your Honor, because of the hard work...especially this is the second budget and working with Alderman Wihby the City is very lucky to have you here, Dave, and I appreciate you being here.

Mayor Baines stated I would join with that, thank you very much.

This being a special meeting of the Board, no further business shall be presented unless by unanimous consent, on motion of Alderman Pariseau, duly seconded by Alderman Thibault, it was voted to adjourn.

A True Record. Attest.

City Clerk